

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to this Amendment, claims 1-20 and 22-24 were pending in the application.

Claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of dependent claims 23-24 to clarify features of the method that directly control client access to content. Claims 23 and 24 are canceled.

Applicants request that the claim amendments be entered because it will not place an undue burden on the Examiner and does not raise new issues as claims 23 and 24 were previously presented in the case and their subject matter previously searched by the Examiner.

Claims 1-20 and 22 remain for consideration by the Examiner.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by International Publication Number: WO 00/51031 ("Hendren"). This rejection is traversed based on the following remarks.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of controlling access of a client to content files during an information search based on a client search profile. The method includes "creating a modified search request by applying a search profile for the client to the received search request." The modified search request is routed to a search engine having a search engine collections populated from the content files. The method of claim 1 further calls for the modifying to include adding a portion of the search profile onto the search request "to specify a set of the search engine collections to be searched", with the specification being achievable because the modification includes providing an "add on restriction comprising a tag label of one of the search engine collections." Hence, the client search profile includes a tag label indicating which search engine collections can be searched and this is provided as an add on restriction to the search request. Applicant provides an example of this technique on page 14 of his specification. Hendren fails to show this method of controlling client access to a search engine collection, and Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

More particularly, the Office Action cites Hendren at Fig. 3A, 303, pages 2-4 for showing adding a portion of the search profile as an add on restriction and at Fig. 2B, element 254, the ZipCode and ParentalControl to "restrict the search area". Applicant disagrees that Hendren at these citations teaches adding a tag label identifying one of the search engine collections as an add on restriction to a search request. First, the search profile needs to include the tag label. Second, the search collections need to include such labels to allow searching to be limited to specific collections. Regarding the first point, Hendren shows in Fig. 3A at step 303 that user profile information may be inserted into a request, but in Fig. 2B, the user profile data at element 254 does NOT include any tag labels for search engine collections.

Regarding the second point, Hendren at the paragraph beginning at line 11 on page 6 teaches how its proxy server 117 may insert user profile information into an HTTP request but there is no discussion that the user profile information includes a tag label for a search engine request or how such information will be used by a search engine. The use of the added information is discussed in the paragraph beginning at line 29 of page 7, but at this point, Hendren states the server must be adapted for recognizing a user profile field 254, which indicates that this is not a mere add on restriction or tag label that would not require a special configuration for use by a search engine. In this paragraph, Hendren then goes on to describe that a web server may customize a page based on the data in the user profile field 254, but nowhere does Hendren suggest that specific search engine collections are identified by a tag label or otherwise by this added data. A ParentControl field may be used to restrict or block a search but does not identify which specific search engine collections should be used to field a search request as would the tag label called for in claim 1. As a result, Hendren fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 1, and claim 1 and claims 2 and 3, which depend from claim 1, are believed allowable over Hendren.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Additionally, in the Office Action, claims 4-5 and 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendren. This rejection is traversed based on the following remarks.

Claims 4-5 depend from claim 1. Hence, claims 4 and 5 are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Independent claim 14 is directed to a Web server with a search engine interface that operates to process a search request "to add a client search profile to the search request to define select collections in the search engine collections for applying the search request." As discussed with reference to claim 1, Hendren fails to teach adding profile data that defines "select collections" for applying a search request. Instead, Hendren teaches providing profile data that can be used to eliminate collections from searches, e.g., a parental control filter, and that can be used by a web server to customize a page. The Office Action cites Hendren at Fig. 3A, element 303 and page 2, but as shown, element 303 simply states inserting profile data but no teaching or suggestion is provided that such information defines select collections to be searched in a search collection. For this reason, the Web server of claim 14 is not shown or suggested by Hendren, and claims 14 and 15-17, which depend from claim 14, are believed allowable over Hendren.

The Office Action further rejected claims 6-13, 18-20, and 22 under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendren in view of Copperman (U.S. Patent No. 6,711,585), which is only a proper reference for what is taught in U.S. Prov. Appl. No. 60/139,509, which Applicant has not been provided to Applicant and Applicant has not had the opportunity to review. With this reservation in mind, this rejection is traversed based on the following remarks.

Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and is believed allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Further, claim 6 calls for intercepting an indexing request from a search engine for content for search engine collections and "in response, returning to the search engine a modified form of the requested set of information." Hence, the search engine is not provided direct access to the content but instead the method calls for returning a modified form

to the request set of information (see, for example, Applicant's Figures 1 and 2 showing the location of the interface between the search engine and the content and showing return of an indexing reply).

The Office Action cites Copperman at col. 16, lines 6-7 and col. 31, lines 47-54. At col. 16, lines 6-7 Copperman is discussing removing or adding "taxonomy tags" but does not suggest intercepting an indexing request from a search engine or returning the requested information in modified form. The tags are simply used to create a plurality of taxonomies. Copperman teaches how a search engine may operate according to his teaching from col. 31, line 42 to col. 33, line 43 with an index being "built for each node of the taxonomies" and then at query time "the search engine aggregates the indexes of the nodes in an identified region to produce a single index for that region" which the search engine then searches. Hence, it can be seen that Copperman teaches first creating a number of taxonomies including taxonomy tags and then generating an index of the nodes of the taxonomies. Copperman does NOT teach intercepting an indexing request and does NOT teach returning the requested information in modified form. Hence, claim 6 is believed allowable over Hendren and Copperman for this additional reason.

Independent claim 7 is directed to a method with limitations similar to claim 6 and is believed allowable for at least the reasons for allowing claim 6. Specifically, neither Hendren nor Copperman teach "receiving with the search engine interface an indexing request from the search engine for a set of information from the content files." Hendren's "interface" only teaches intercepting a request from a user or client. Copperman teaches using a search engine to create an index of nodes in a plurality of taxonomies but not that the indexing request would be received by an interface positioned between it and the content. Further, as discussed with relation to claim 6, Copperman fails to show or suggest an interface that acts for a search engine to retrieve the requested information from the content files and also acts to modify content in the set of retrieved information. Hence, claim 7 is not shown or suggested by the combined teaching of these references.

Claims 8-13 depend from claim 7 and are believed allowable at least for the reasons for

allowing claim 7. Further, claims 8 and 9 call for the modifying to include removing metatags from and adding information to the information retrieved for the search engine by the interface. Copperman teaches removing or modifying taxonomy tags, but these are not being removed or added as part of responding to an index request from a search engine. Claim 10 calls for the received search request to include "a client search profile defining select collections in the search engine collections for applying the search request," and claim 11 calls for modifying the search request similarly to claim 1. As discussed with reference to claim 1, Hendren teaches inserting profile information into a request but this does information does not define collections for searching by a search engine. For these additional reasons, claims 8-12 are allowable over Hendren and Copperman.

Claim 13 calls for the positioning of the search engine interface to include "constructing an instance of the search engine interface that is configured for communicating with the search engine." An embodiment of this step is explained in Applicant's specification at page 17, lines 3-22, and it can be seen that this allows the interface to communicate with a variety of types of search engines in contrast to prior art interfaces as discussed in Applicant's specification at page 2, lines 6-11. The Office Action admits that Hendren and Copperman fail to teach the limitation of claim 13 and instead cites a IEEE dictionary for the term "interface" but this fails to teach constructing an instance for the particular search engine as part of an access control method. For this additional reason, claim 13 is not shown or suggested by Hendren and Copperman.

Independent claim 18 is directed to a computer program for controlling access to content files and includes limitations similar to that of claims 1 and 7 and is believed allowable over Hendren for the reasons provided for allowing claim 1. Further, claim 18 is believed allowable over the combination of Hendren and Copperman for the reasons for allowing claim 7. Claims 19 and 20 depend from claim 18 and are believed allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Conclusions


In view of the above, the pending claims are believed in condition for allowance.

No fee is believed due with this Amendment, but any fee deficiency associated with this submittal may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1123.

It is respectfully requested that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 12/30/04



Kent Lembke, Reg. No. 44,866
Hogan & Hartson LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
Telephone: (720) 406-5378
Fax: (720) 406-5301